RNA substructure as a random matrix ensemble

Sang Kwan Choi,* Chaiho Rim,† and Hwajin Um‡
Department of Physics, Sogang University, Seoul 121-742, Korea
(Dated: February 10, 2017)

We obtain a closed form of generating functions of RNA substructure using hermitian matrix model with the Chebyshev polynomial of the second kind, which has the form of the hypergeometric function. To match the experimental findings of the statistical behavior, we regard the substructure as a grand canonical ensemble and find its fugacity value corresponding to the number of stems. We also suggest a hierarchical picture based on the planar structure so that the non-planar structure such as pseudoknot are included.

arXiv:1612.07468v2 [q-bio.QM] 9 Feb 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Ribonucleic acid (RNA) is a single strand of long nucleotides and plays an important role in producing protein. The functional form of RNA nucleotides requires a specific tertiary structure and its scaffold is provided by secondary structural elements with hydrogen bonds between the nucleotides.

The secondary structure shows many different recognizable domains such as hairpin loops, bulges and internal loops which are topologically equivalent to a planar structure. There appears also non-planar structure such as pseudoknot which contains higher genus. The configuration was intensively studied numerically [1–3]. Combinatoric analysis of the configuration is also in progress [4–6].

In this letter, we propose to investigate the secondary structure from the geometrical point of view, using the hermitian random matrix model [7, 8] as was extensively used in the geometric analysis of 2d quantum gravity [9]. The planar structure corresponds to the large N limit of the matrix model, N being the size of the matrix. We are using the hermitian matrix M with a Gaussian potential whose propagator describes the link between A and U or C and G. This link is also named as chord in the combinatoric analysis. Since our primary interest lies in the combinatorics of the links, we do not distinguish purines (A,U) or pyrimidines (C,G) in this letter.

Even though we are using the hermitian random matrix model, we pursuit a different approach from the previous ones [7, 8]. For the initial setting to describe the RNA strand, we classify the long chain as islands and bridges (Fig.1). An island is a set of RNA nucleotides all of which participate in the planar configuration and there is no link inside the island. The nucleotides in an island can link to nucleotides in a different island. We will denote the nucleotides in the i-th island as $U^{(i)}(M)$. On the other hand, a set of RNA nucleotides on a bridge do not participate in the planar bonds, which may remain as dangled bonds or involve non-planar structure such as pseudoknots. In this consideration, one RNA strand is a sequence of alternative island and bridge. The total number of nucleotides is $\sum_{i=1}^{I}(\ell_i + b_i)$ where $\ell_i(b_i)$ is the number of nucleotides in the i-th island (bridge). Here, we conveniently identify the bridge before the first island with the one after the last island.



FIG. 1. Secondary structure and its equivalent picture in sequence of island and bridge. Island is a set of nucleotides which has no internal links. The links are connected between different islands only. Bridge is a set of nucleotides which do not link to other nucleotides in the planar configuration.

According to the definition of the sequence, there is no chord inside an island and therefore, the nucleotides in an island itself has no expectation value, $\langle \mathrm{Tr}\, U^{(i)}(M)\rangle = 0$. We find that this constraint is automatically satisfied at the large N limit if one uses the Chebyshev polynomial of the second kind, $U^{(i)}(M) = U_{\ell_i}(M/2)$ [10]. One can demonstrate this fact using the property of the hermitian matrix model, where $\langle \mathrm{Tr} M^{2k}\rangle$ is given as the Catalan number C_k, if the expectations are appropriately normalized so that $C_0 = C_1 = 1$. Therefore, the expectation value $A = \langle \mathrm{Tr} \prod_{i=1}^{I} U_{\ell_i}(M/2)\rangle$ of the nucleotides on the whole islands provides the number of ways of linking between islands. The merit of the Chebyshev polynomial lies in the fact that the ortho-normality relation $\int_{-1}^{1} U_k(\xi)U_\ell(\xi)\sqrt{1-\xi^2}d\xi = \frac{\pi}{2}\delta_{k,\ell}$ greatly simplifies the calculation. Since the only non-vanishing contribution of the expectation value comes as $\langle \mathrm{Tr}\ U_0(M/2)\rangle$, one can evaluate the expectation value A

$$A = \frac{2}{\pi}\int_{-1}^{1} \prod_{i=1}^{I} U_{\ell_i}(\xi)U_0(\xi)\sqrt{1-\xi^2}d\xi\,. \qquad (1)$$

* hermit1231@sogang.ac.kr
† rimpine@sogang.ac.kr
‡ um16@sogang.ac.kr

II. RESULTS

A. Generating functions

Based on the integration formula, we can find the generating function in a closed form. Let us denote the number of configurations of secondary structures with h hairpins, I islands and ℓ chords as $g(h,I,\ell)$. It is easy to find $g(h,I,\ell)$ if one uses the hairpin loop property. First, we may regroup the islands between two consecutive hairpin loops as one effective island since there is no chord connected inside the effective island. Suppose there are I_a-islands and k_a-nucleotides in one effective island, then the way to make the effective island is given in terms of binomial $\binom{k_a-1}{I_a-1}$. Noting that one hairpin loop requires at least one chord, one concludes that

$$g(h,I,\ell) = \sum_{\{k_a,I_a\}} \prod_{a=1}^{h+1} \binom{k_a-1}{I_a-1} \times \left\langle \mathrm{Tr}\, U_{k_1-1} \prod_{j=2}^{h} U_{k_j-2}\, U_{k_{h+1}-1} \right\rangle \quad (2)$$

where k_a and l_a are constrained as $k_1+\cdots+k_{h+1}=2\ell$ and $I_1+\cdots+I_{h+1}=\ell$. This complicated expression is greatly simplified if one uses the property of the Chebyshev polynomial,

$$\sum_{k\geq 0}\sum_{i=0}^{k} z^{k/2}\, y^i\, U_k(\xi) = \frac{1}{1-2\sqrt{z}(1+y)\xi + z(1+y)^2}\,. \quad (3)$$

Then the integral expression in (2) is put into a compact form of a generating function $G(x,y,z) := \sum_{h,I,\ell} g(h,I,\ell) x^h y^I z^\ell$,

$$G(x,y,z) = \sum_h x^h\, z^h\, y^{h+1}\,(1+y)^{h-1} \times {}_2F_1(h+1,h;2;z(1+y)^2). \quad (4)$$

Here ${}_2F_1(a,b;c;z)$ is the hypergeometric function and can be written as ${}_2F_1(h+1,h;2;z) = \sum_{k\geq 0} N(h+k,h) z^k$ where $N(a,b) = \frac{1}{a}\binom{a}{b}\binom{a}{b-1}$ is the Narayana number whose generating function is known (see for instance [11]). Therefore, one can rewrite $G(x,y,z)$ in the closed form

$$G(x,y,z) = \left(\frac{y}{1+y}\right) \times \frac{1-A(1+B)-\sqrt{1-2A(1+B)+A^2(1-B)^2}}{2A} \quad (5)$$

where $A = z(1+y)^2$ and $B = x\,y/(1+y)$.

The power series of the generating function provides the information on $g(h,I,\ell)$ which will be the building block of other generating functions. For example, to investigate further details of the secondary structures, one introduces a concept of stem, a configuration with maximal consecutive parallel chords. Stem appears when linking two islands. Let us add one more variable, the number k of stems to $g(h,I,\ell)$ so that the number of configurations of stems are given as $f(k,h,I,\ell)$. Finding $f(k,h,I,\ell)$ is based on the number of the single-stack diagrams. Single-stack diagram contains stack-length one only, meaning there is no two chords connecting two chosen islands. Therefore, the number of chords is the same as the number of stems in the single-stack diagram. Denoting the number of the single-stack diagrams as $s(h,I,\ell)$, one has $s(h,I,\ell) = s(h,I,k)$. As a result, we have the relation

$$f(k,h,I,\ell) = \binom{\ell-1}{k-1} s(h,I,k) \quad (6)$$

because any planar secondary structure can be constructed by stacking chords on each single chords of the single-stack diagrams. This shows that the generating function $F(u,x,y,z) := \sum_{k,h,I,\ell} f(k,h,I,\ell)\, u^k x^h y^I z^\ell$ is given as

$$F(u,x,y,z) = S\Big(x,y,\frac{u\,z}{1-z}\Big) \quad (7)$$

where $S(x,y,z) := \sum_{h,I,\ell} s(h,I,\ell)\, x^h y^I z^\ell$. Finally, noting that $F(1,x,y,z) = G(x,y,z)$, one finds $S(x,y,z) = G(x,y,z/(1+z))$ and therefore,

$$F(u,x,y,z) = G\Big(x,y,\frac{u\,z}{1+u\,z-z}\Big)\,. \quad (8)$$

B. Stack stability and constraint

Let us investigate the result of the generating functions. Using $f(k,h,I,\ell)$ one may define $\Omega_{k,\ell} = \sum_{h,I} f(k,h,I,\ell)$ which represents the number of secondary structures with k stems and ℓ chords. From (6) and $S(1,1,z)$, one finds the explicit formula

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{k,\ell} =& \frac{1}{16}\binom{\ell-1}{k-1}\left(\frac{7}{10}\right)^{k+1} \times \sum_{p=[\frac{k}{2}]}^{k+1} \frac{1}{2p-1}\binom{2p}{p}\binom{p}{k-p+1}\left(\frac{25}{7}\right)^p \\ =& \binom{\ell-1}{k-1} 5^{k-1}\, {}_2F_1\left(\frac{1-k}{2},\frac{2-k}{2};2;\frac{32}{25}\right)\end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $[k]$ is the integer smaller than or equal to k. For given ℓ, if one plots $\Omega_{k,\ell}$ as a function of k/ℓ, one finds the most probable distribution near $k/\ell = 1$ (blue squared mark in Fig.2). However, according to the experimental findings, the secondary structures has more than two average chord per stem. This is due to the stability of stems which may require a certain stack of chords from the energetic point of view.



FIG. 2. Normalized distribution $\Omega_{k,\ell}\, e^{\mu\, k}/(\sum_k \Omega_{k,\ell}\, e^{\mu\, k})$ of secondary structures as a function of k/ℓ for $\ell = 100$: Blue square($\mu = 0$), orange triangle($\mu = -2$), red circle($\mu = -4$).

One simple way to proceed is to exclude the structures having any stack of chords less than r and consider r-canonical structures, which can be built up from the single-stack diagrams by adding $r-1$ more chords at each single chord:

$$F(u\, z^{r-1}, x, y, z) = G\Big(x, y, \frac{u\, z^r}{1 + u\, z^r - z}\Big)\,. \qquad (10)$$

However, we choose another way and allow the number of chords per stem to fluctuate so that the system is analogous to the grand canonical ensemble rather than the canonical one. We may evaluate the average number of stems by introducing a certain weight (fugacity) in creating stems. If we put the fugacity as e^{μ} with μ playing the role of the chemical potential, one finds

$$F(u\, e^{\mu}, x, y, z) = G\Big(x, y, \frac{u\, z\, e^{\mu}}{1 + u\, z\, e^{\mu} - z}\Big) \qquad (11)$$

which is equivalent to replace $\Omega_{k,\ell}$ with $e^{\mu k}\Omega_{k,\ell}$. We expect $\frac{\partial}{\partial k}\left(e^{\mu k}\Omega_{k,\ell}\right)\big|_{k=k_0} = 0$ at the average value of $k = k_0$ which determines the fugacity. Depending on the value of μ, one finds the peak value k_0 of $\Omega_{k,\ell}$ shifted (orange triangle or red circle marks in Fig.2). The database [3] shows that RNA molecules tend to have the average stack length per stem in the range from 2 to 10, mostly near 4 independent of ℓ. Referring to this, one may require k_0/ℓ to be in the range from 1/5 to 1/3 and finds μ, linearly fitted as (Fig.3)

$$\mu(k_0) \simeq -4.7 + 5.0\, k_0/\ell \qquad (12)$$

whose number is only slightly changed as ℓ varies.

This idea is tested using the data obtained from [3]. The number of RNA molecules is given by a histogram as a function of k/ℓ where we set the interval of the bin to be 0.02 (Fig.4) and require $\ell \geq 50$ so that at each bin the data is not empty. The total number of collected data turns out to be 335 from [3] and they are distributed as 283 ($50 \leq \ell < 150$) and 52 ($150 \leq \ell$). The best sample will be the data set with given ℓ. However, we cannot get a significant number of data set with a given ℓ. To overcome the statistical error, we use the whole data set with $\ell \geq 50$ assuming different ℓ of the data set does not affect much of the result. The histogram shows $0.22 \leq k_0/\ell < 0.24$ and therefore, $\mu \simeq -3.6$. For comparison, the normalized distributions corresponding to $\mu = -3.6$ are plotted using the generating function when $\ell = 50$(blue circle), 100(red triangle), 200(orange square). Different ℓ shows only the slight change of the standard deviation which confirms the assumption. Even though we consider the model which neglects the bonding energy difference according to nucleotides involved, the stem distribution shows that the result is not much affected by the bonding energy difference.



FIG. 3. Chemical potential μ as a function of the peak value k_0/ℓ for $\ell = 100$. The linear fitting is shown for the range from 1/5 to 1/3.



FIG. 4. Histogram of RNA for $\ell \geq 50$ obtained from [3] as a function of k/ℓ. Normalized distributions $\Omega_{k,\ell}\, e^{\mu\, k}/(\sum_k \Omega_{k,\ell}\, e^{\mu\, k})$ for $\mu = -3.6$ when $\ell = 50$(blue circle), 100(red triangle), 200(orange square) are given for comparison.

III. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We consider the secondary structure of RNA using the planar limit of the hermitian matrix model. Using the orthonormal property of Chebyshev polynomial, we can derive various generating functions of the combinatorics of the secondary structure in a closed form. In addition, we introduce the fugacity to match the experimental finding of average number of chords in a stem. As a result, we can find the chemical potential of the stem from the pure combinatorics only.

One way of interpreting the chemical potential from the perspective of usual energy model is the stacking energy of base pairs. It is believed that the attractive energy between two consecutive base pairs is the main contribution to the stability of the stem. The stacking energy depends not only on the nucleotides involved but also on the stacking order of the two pairs along the backbone [12]. Nevertheless, if we assume an average stacking energy ϵ at some fixed temperature, we may have additional statistical factor $e^{\epsilon(\ell-k)}$ to $\Omega_{k,\ell}$ for the given structures with k stems and ℓ chords. When we consider the distribution for fixed ℓ, the factor $e^{\epsilon\ell}$ cancels out by the normalization. Therefore, one may view the chemical potential as the average stacking energy, $\mu = -\epsilon$. From the energetic consideration, it is natural to fix the reference point where appropriate number of unpaired nucleotides is already assigned on the bridges since the number of ways to put unpaired nucleotides on the bridges can significantly change the value of ϵ.

One may further find a generating function when a number of nucleotides is given. In this case we need to consider the nucleotides on the bridges also. Let us introduce one more variable w corresponding to the number of nucleotides. First, the number $I-1-h$ of bridges between islands (excluding hairpin loops and two bridges at the end of RNA strand) must contain at least one nucleotide which will give the factor w^{I-1-h}. Second, each chord has two nucleotides and gives the factor $w^{2\ell}$ for given ℓ. Third, there are $I+1$ bridges on the RNA strand and one may put arbitrary number of nucleotides on each bridge which introduces the factor $1/(1-w)^{I+1}$. In addition to this, one may constraint the minimum number of nucleotides $\lambda-1$ to each hairpin loop. This constraint shifts the variable x to $xw^{\lambda-1}$. As a result, the generating function of a given number of nucleotides can be obtained from the previous generating functions by replacing the variables $x \to xw^{\lambda-2}$, $y \to yw/(1-w)$, $z \to zw^2$ and multiplying the overall factor $1/(w(1-w))$. For instance, one obtains r-canonical generating function $R_\lambda(u\,z^{r-1}, x, y, z; w) := \sum_{k,h,I,\ell,n} r_\lambda(k,h,I,\ell;n)\, u^k x^h y^I z^\ell w^n$,

$$R_\lambda(u\,z^{r-1}, x, y, z; w) = \frac{1}{w(1-w)} F\left(u(zw^2)^{r-1}, xw^{\lambda-2}, \frac{y\,w}{1-w}, zw^2\right). \tag{13}$$

One can check that the generating function $R_\lambda(z^{r-1}, 1, 1, z; w)$ agrees with the one $S_\lambda^{[r]}(w,z)$ appeared in [13] where stems, hairpin loops and islands are not the observables: $R_\lambda(z^{r-1},1,1,z;w) = S_\lambda^{[r]}(w,z) - 1/(1-w)$.

The idea of alternate sequence of island and bridge of RNA strand suggests that pseudoknot configuration can be investigated similarly. Even though the pseudoknot is a non-planar structure, one may view the pseudoknot as another planar structure connecting nucleotides on the bridges. In this approach, one may regroup all the nucleotides on the bridges and form another alternate sequence of island and bridge. In this hierarchical picture, one may use the same generating functions obtained in the text which will greatly simplify the combinatorics. Similar idea is found in [2]. This hierarchical picture counts the multitude of genus structures at one setting, and is thus, different from the conventional topological genus expansion approach in [8].

In our approach, we ignore the difference between purines and pyrimidines. As far as the combinatorics are concerned, one may neglect the difference. On the other hand, as seen in the average number of stems per chord, eventually one has to take into account the energetic stability. For more realistic investigation, one may introduce two kinds of chords and investigate the energetic stability replacing part of chords with new ones from the homogeneous chords structure and allow realistic heterostructure of AU and CG bondings. We hope this problem solved in a near future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the support of this work by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIP) (NRF-2014R1A2A2A01004951).

[1] P. G. Higgs, Quarterly Reviews of Biophysics **33**, 199 (2000).
[2] E. Rivas and S. R. Eddy, Journal of Molecular Biology **285**, 2053 (1999).
[3] M. Andronescu, V. Bereg, H. H. Hoos, and A. Condon, BMC Bioinformatics **9**, 340 (2008).
[4] M. S. Waterman, Adv. math. suppl. studies **1**, 167 (1978).
[5] T. J. X. Li and C. M. Reidys, Journal of Mathematical Biology , 1 (2016).
[6] I. L. Hofacker, P. Schuster, and P. F. Stadler, Discrete Applied Mathematics **88**, 207 (1998).
[7] G. Vernizzi, H. Orland, and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**,

168103 (2005).
[8] J. E. Andersen, L. O. Chekhov, R. C. Penner, C. M. Reidys, and P. Sulkowski, Biochem. Soc. Trans. **41**, 652 (2013), arXiv:1303.1326 [q-bio.QM].
[9] P. H. Ginsparg, M. Goulian, M. R. Plesser, and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. **B342**, 539 (1990).
[10] Draft in preparation.
[11] P. Barry and A. Hennessy, Journal of Integer Sequences **14**, 1 (2011).
[12] S. M. Freier, R. Kierzek, J. a. Jaeger, N. Sugimoto, M. H. Caruthers, T. Neilson, and D. H. Turner, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **83**, 9373 (1986).
[13] C. L. Barrett, T. J. Li, and C. M. Reidys, Journal of Computational Biology **23**, 857 (2016), arXiv:1603.03653 [math.CO].